arXiv:1212.2700v1 [gr-qc] 12 Dec 2012

Planck Scale Physics and Bogoliubov Spaces in a Bose–Einstein Condensate

E. Castellanos*
Departamento de Física,
Centro de Investigación y Estudios Avanzados del IPN
A. P. 14–740, 07000, México, D.F., México.

(Dated: December 13, 2012)

We analyze the consequences caused by a deformed relation, suggested in several quantum gravity models, upon a bosonic gas. Concerning the ground state of the Bogoliubov space of this system, we deduce the corrections in the pressure, the speed of sound, and the corresponding healing length. Indeed, we prove that the corrections in the relevant thermodynamic properties associated to the ground state, defines a non trivial function of the density of particles and the deformation parameters, allowing us to constrain, in principle, the form of the energy–momentum dispersion relation. In addition, we calculate the condensation temperature associated to the non-interacting system, and show that this fact could be used also, to infer representative bounds for the deformation parameters, under typical laboratory conditions.

PACS numbers: 04.60-m, 04.60.Bc, 03.75.Nt

I. INTRODUCTION

The possibility of a deformation in the dispersion relation of microscopic particles, appears in connection with the quest for a quantum theory of gravity [1–9]. In some schemes, the possibility that the space-time could be quantized, can be characterized, from a phenomenological point of view, as a modification in the dispersion relation of microscopic particles [2, 3, 5] (and references therein). A modified dispersion relation emerges as an adequate tool in the search for phenomenological consequences caused by this type of quantum gravity models. Nevertheless, the most difficult aspect in the search of experimental hints relevant for the quantum-gravity problem is the smallness of the involved effects [3, 4]. If this kind of deformations are characterized by some Planck scale, then the quantum gravity effects become very small [2, 5]. In the non–relativistic limit, the dispersion relation can be expressed as follows [5, 6]

$$E \simeq m + \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2M_p}\Big(\xi_1 mp + \xi_2 p^2 + \xi_3 \frac{p^2}{m}\Big), \quad (1)$$

in units where the speed of light $c = 1$, being M_p ($\simeq 1.2 \times 10^{28} eV$) the Planck mass. The three parameters ξ_1, ξ_2, and ξ_3, are model dependent [2, 5], and should take positive or negative values close to 1. There are some evidence within the formalism of Loop quantum gravity [5–8] that indicates a non–zero values for the three parameters, ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3, and particulary [7, 9] that produces a linear–momentum term in the non–relativistic limit. Unfortunately, as is usual in quantum gravity phenomenology, the possible bounds associated with the deformation parameters, open a wide range of possible magnitudes, which is translated to a significant challenge.

In a previous report [37], we were able to prove, that the condensation temperature associated to the non–interacting bosonic gas, trapped in a generic three dimensional power law potential, is corrected as a consequence of the deformation in the dispersion relation. Moreover, this correction described as a non-trivial function of the number of particles and the shape associated to the corresponding trap it could provide representative bounds for the deformation parameter ξ_1. We have proved that the deformation parameter ξ_1 can be bounded, under typical conditions, from $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^6$ to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^2$, by using different classes of trapping potentials in the thermodynamic limit. In the case of a harmonic oscillator–type potential, we have obtained a bound up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^4$.

In references [5, 6] it was suggested the use of ultra-precise cold-atom-recoil experiments to constrain the form of the energy-momentum dispersion relation in the non–relativistic limit. There, the bound associated to ξ_1 is at least, four orders of magnitude smaller than the bound associated to a Bose–Einstein condensate trapped in a harmonic oscillator obtained in reference [37]. However, the results obtained in reference [37], suggest that the many body contributions would allow to improve, in principle, the bounds associated to ξ_1. These facts open the possibility to explore the corrections caused by an anomalous dispersion relation, on the relevant thermodynamic properties associated to N–body systems, for instance, within the Bogolioubov formalism associated to Bose–Einstein condensates.

The phenomenon of Bose–Einstein condensation, from the theoretical and experimental point of view, has produced an enormous amount of interesting publications associated to this topic [10–30] (and references therein). Among the issues addressed we may find its possible use as tools in the search of quantum–gravity manifestations, for instance, in the context of Lorentz violation or to provide phenomenological constrains on Planck–scale physics [31–39].

For this purpose, we define the next *modified* N-body

---

* ecastellanos@fis.cinvestav.mx

Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\vec{k}=0}\left\{\frac{\hbar^2k^2}{2m} + \alpha\hbar k + mc^2\right\}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}}\hat{a}_{\vec{k}} + \frac{U_0}{2V}\sum_{\vec{k}=0}\sum_{\vec{p}=0}\sum_{\vec{q}=0}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{p}}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{q}}\hat{a}_{\vec{p}+\vec{k}}\hat{a}_{\vec{q}-\vec{k}}, \quad (2)$$

where $U_0 = \frac{4\pi a\hbar^2}{m}$, being a the s–wave scattering length, mc^2 is the rest mass, and the term $\alpha\hbar k$ with $\alpha = \xi_1\frac{mc}{2M_p}$, in ordinary units, is the leading order modification in expression (1). The system under study will be a Bose–Einstein gas enclosed in a container of volume V, having a deformed dispersion relation as a single particle energy spectrum. Additionally, the interaction between two particles will be assumed to be dominated by s–scattering, i.e., the temperature of the system is very low ($ka << 1$, where $\vec{k}$ and a are the wave vector and the scattering length, respectively) [43].

The main goal of this work is to analyze the corrections caused by a deformed dispersion relation upon the properties associated to the ground state of a Bose–Einstein condensate, within the Bogolioubov formalism. In other words, we will show that the many–body contributions associated to this system, could be used, in principle, to establish some meaningful bounds for the deformation parameter ξ_1. Finally, we calculate the shift on the condensation temperature for non–interacting systems, caused by a deformed dispersion relation, and show that this alternative procedure can be used also to provide representative bounds for ξ_1.

II. MODIFIED BOGOLIUBOV SPACES

In this section let us calculate the corrections on some relevant thermodynamical properties, caused by the deformation parameter α in a Bose–Einstein condensate within the Bogolioubov formalism (see for instance, [42, 46]). After some assumptions, the second right hand term in equation (2), very close to the temperature $T = 0$, can be re–expressed as follows [44, 46]

$$\sum_{\vec{k}=0}\sum_{\vec{p}=0}\sum_{\vec{q}=0}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{p}}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{q}}\hat{a}_{\vec{p}+\vec{k}}\hat{a}_{\vec{q}-\vec{k}} = N^2 + 2N\sum_{\vec{k}\neq 0}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}}\hat{a}_{\vec{k}} + N\sum_{\vec{k}\neq 0}\Big(\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{-\vec{k}} + \hat{a}_{\vec{k}}\hat{a}_{-\vec{k}}\Big). \quad (3)$$

With these approximations the N–body Hamiltonian has the following structure

$$\hat{H} = \frac{U_0N^2}{2V} + mc^2N + \sum_{\vec{k}\neq 0}\Big[\frac{\hbar^2k^2}{2m} + \alpha\hbar k + mc^2 + \frac{U_0N}{V}\Big]\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}}\hat{a}_{\vec{k}} + N\frac{U_0}{2V}\Big[\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{-\vec{k}} + \hat{a}_{\vec{k}}\hat{a}_{-\vec{k}}\Big]. \quad (4)$$

This Hamiltonian can be diagonalized introducing the Bogoliubov transformations [43]

$$\hat{b}_{\vec{k}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma_k^2}}\Big[\hat{a}_{\vec{k}} + \gamma_k\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{-\vec{k}}\Big], \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{b}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma_k^2}}\Big[\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}} + \gamma_k\hat{a}_{-\vec{k}}\Big]. \quad (6)$$

These two operators fulfill the same algebra related to $\hat{a}_{\vec{k}}$ and $\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}}$, i.e., they are also bosonic operators. In this last expression the following definitions have been introduced

$$\epsilon_{k_\alpha} = \frac{\hbar^2k^2}{2m} + \alpha\hbar k + mc^2, \quad (7)$$

$$\gamma_k = 1 + \frac{V\epsilon_{k_\alpha}}{U_0N} - \sqrt{\frac{V\epsilon_{k_\alpha}}{U_0N}}\sqrt{2 + \frac{V\epsilon_{k_\alpha}}{U_0N}}. \quad (8)$$

The final form for our Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = \frac{U_0N^2}{2V} + mc^2N + \sum_{\vec{k}\neq 0}\Bigg\{\sqrt{\epsilon_{k_\alpha}\Big(\epsilon_{k_\alpha} + \frac{2U_0N}{V}\Big)}\hat{b}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}}\hat{b}_{\vec{k}} - \frac{1}{2}\Bigg[\frac{U_0N}{V} + \epsilon_{k_\alpha} - \sqrt{\epsilon_{k_\alpha}\Big(\epsilon_{k_\alpha} + \frac{2U_0N}{V}\Big)}\Bigg]\Bigg\}. \quad (9)$$

The last summation diverges, a result already known [45, 46], and this divergence disappears introducing the so–called pseudo–potential method, which implies that we must perform the following substitution [46]

$$-\frac{1}{2}\Big[\frac{U_0N}{V} + \epsilon_{k_\alpha} - \sqrt{\epsilon_{k_\alpha}(\epsilon_{k_\alpha} + \frac{2U_0N}{V})}\Big] \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}\Big[\frac{U_0N}{V} + \epsilon_{k_\alpha} - \sqrt{\epsilon_{k_\alpha}(\epsilon_{k_\alpha} + \frac{2U_0N}{V})} - \frac{1}{2\epsilon_{k_\alpha}}\big(\frac{U_0N}{V}\big)^2\Big]. \quad (10)$$

Finally, this last summation will be approximated by an integral. It is noteworthy to mention that the usual integral, has as a lower limit the value $k = 0$ [42, 46]. However, the *modified* integral given here, does not have as a lower limit the value $k = 0$. In other words,

$$-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\vec{k}\neq 0}\Big[\frac{U_0N}{V} + \epsilon_{k_\alpha} - \sqrt{\epsilon_{k_\alpha}(\epsilon_{k_\alpha} + \frac{2U_0N}{V})} - \frac{1}{2\epsilon_{k_\alpha}}\big(\frac{U_0N}{V}\big)^2\Big] \approx -\frac{2\pi V(2m)^{3/2}}{(2\pi\hbar)^3}\Big(\frac{U_0N}{V}\Big)^{5/2}\int_{\delta}^{\infty}x^2f(x)dx + \alpha\frac{8\pi m^2V}{(2\pi\hbar)^3}\Big(\frac{U_0N}{V}\Big)^2\int_{\delta}^{\infty}xf(x)dx, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\delta = \sqrt{mc^2\Big(\frac{V}{U_0N}\Big)}. \quad (12)$$

Additionally

$$f(x) = \Big[1 + x^2 - x\sqrt{2 + x^2} - \frac{1}{2x^2}\Big], \quad (13)$$

$$x = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{k_\alpha} V}{U_0 N}}, \tag{14}$$

note that in the case $\alpha = 0$, we recover the usual result [46], but corrected by the contributions of the rest energy. With these conditions we deduce the final structure of the N–body Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = E_0 + \sum_{\vec{k}\neq 0} E_k \hat{b}^{\dagger}_{\vec{k}} \hat{b}_{\vec{k}}. \tag{15}$$

In this last expression E_0 denotes the energy of the ground state of the corresponding Bogoliubov space [43], corrected by the contributions of the deformation parameter α and the rest energy

$$E_0 = \frac{2\pi a \hbar^2 N^2}{mV}\Bigg[1 + 8\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\frac{a^3 N}{V\pi}}\left(\frac{8\sqrt{2}}{15} - \frac{1}{2}\delta\right) \tag{16}$$
$$+ \alpha \frac{2am}{\pi^2 \hbar}\Big(0.05 + \ln\delta\Big)\Bigg] + mc^2 N + O(\delta^2, \alpha^2).$$

On the other hand, we have that the modified–energy of the Bogoliubov excitations (E_k) is given by

$$E_k = \sqrt{\epsilon_{k_\alpha}\left(\epsilon_{k_\alpha} + \frac{2U_0 N}{V}\right)}. \tag{17}$$

Rescaling the energy by the rest mass and in the long–wavelength limit $k \to 0$, expression (17) becomes

$$E_{k_\alpha} = \left[\frac{\hbar^2 k}{2m} + \frac{\alpha\hbar}{2}\right]\sqrt{\frac{16\pi a N}{V}}. \tag{18}$$

On the other hand, at the high–energy limit, $k \to \infty$, expression (17) becomes

$$E_{k_\alpha} = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} + \alpha\hbar k + \frac{4\pi\hbar^2 N a}{mV}, \tag{19}$$

which basically corresponds to the deformed dispersion relation, expression (1), corrected by the mean field contributions. If we set $\alpha = 0$ in equations (18) and (19), we recover the usual result [46]. From equations (18) and (19), we are able to define the corresponding healing length

$$\xi \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi a n}}\Big(1 - \alpha\frac{m}{\hbar\sqrt{8\pi a n}}\Big), \tag{20}$$

if we set $\alpha = 0$, we recover the usual result [42–44, 46]. Under typical conditions the healing length is approximately (or bigger than) one micrometer [41]. The order of magnitude associated to the correction caused by the deformation term is of order $10^{-5}\, m!$ for $|\xi_1| \lesssim 1$ in the case of ${}^{39}_{19}K$ for typical densities $10^{13} - 10^{15}$ atoms per cm^3. Additionally, these facts allow us to bound the deformation parameter up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 2.4 \times 10^{-2}$ for a typical healing length of order $10^{-6}\ m$. Notice that more diluted systems could be used to improve the bound associated to ξ_1, and also obtain a possible measure of the deformation parameter ξ_1.

On the other hand, the pressure ($P_0 = -\frac{\partial E_0}{\partial V}$) and speed of sound ($v_s = \sqrt{-\frac{V^2}{Nm}\frac{\partial P_0}{\partial V}}$) associated to the ground state of the Bogoliubov space become, respectively

$$P_0 = \frac{2\pi a\hbar^2 N^2}{mV^2}\Bigg[1 + \frac{194}{15}\sqrt{\frac{a^3 N}{V\pi}}\Big(1 - \frac{15}{16\sqrt{2}}\delta\Big) \tag{21}$$
$$+ \alpha\frac{2am}{\pi^2\hbar}\Big(\ln\delta - \frac{9}{20}\Big)\Bigg] + O(\delta^2, \alpha^2),$$

$$v_s^2 = \frac{4\pi a\hbar^2 N}{m^2 V}\Bigg[1 + \frac{242}{15}\sqrt{\frac{a^3 N}{V\pi}}\Big(1 - \frac{15}{16\sqrt{2}}\delta\Big) \tag{22}$$
$$+ \alpha\frac{2am}{\hbar\pi^2}\Big(\ln\delta - \frac{31}{20}\Big)\Bigg] + O(\delta^2, \alpha^2).$$

The detection of the speed of sound in condensates has already a long history [24, 25]. Notice that the possibility of detecting the term depending upon the deformation parameter α (δv_s^α) requires that, if $\Delta(v_s)$ is the experimental error, then $\Delta v_s < |\delta v_s^\alpha|$. In our case this entails

$$\Delta(v_s) < \sqrt{\alpha\frac{8a^2\hbar N}{\pi m V}\Big(\ln\delta - \frac{31}{20}\Big)}. \tag{23}$$

Under these conditions an experimental uncertainty $\Delta(v_s)$ of order $10^{-6}\sqrt{|\xi_1|}$ could be tuned, in principle, below Planck-scale induced speed of sound, under typical conditions. In other words, high precision measurements are required. Here, it is noteworthy to mention that the accuracy in the speed of sound measurements is not reported in the literature, at least in the literature known by the author. The speed of sound in a condensate is typically of order $10^{-3}\mathrm{m}s^{-1}$ [25], this fact allows us to infer a bound for the deformation parameter up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 6 \times 10^3$, for typical densities of order $10^{13} - 10^{15}$ atoms per cm^3 [10, 47]. Conversely, the case $|\xi_1| \lesssim 1$, lead to densities of order 10^{18} atoms per cm^3, assuming a speed of sound of order $10^{-3} m\, s^{-1}$, that is, three orders of magnitude bigger than typical densities. Notice also that, the correction upon the speed of sound caused by α, is a non–trivial function of the density n, which is proportional to the product $\alpha\, n \ln n^{-1/2}$, this relation between the deformation parameter α and the density n, suggests that denser systems would allow improve, in principle, the bound associated to ξ_1.

III. CONDENSATION TEMPERATURE FOR THE CASE $U_0 = 0$

Let us analyze the condensation temperature associated to an uniform Bose–Einstein gas in a box, in order to obtain representative bounds associated with the deformation parameter ξ_1, within the semiclassical approximation [10, 44]. Let us take into account the leading order modification in expression (1), or equivalently, if we set $a = 0$ in expression (19), this leads to the following dispersion relation between energy and momentum

$$E_p = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \alpha p. \tag{24}$$

The single–particle phase–space distribution for bosons, can be written as [10, 44]

$$n(\vec{r}, \vec{p}) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta(E_p - \mu)} - 1}, \tag{25}$$

where $\beta = 1/\kappa T$, κ is the Boltzmann constant, and T the temperature. Additionally, μ is the chemical potential. In the semiclassical approximation, the number of particles in the 3–dimensional space obeys the normalization condition [10, 44]

$$N = \frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \int d^3\vec{r}\, d^3\vec{p}\, n(\vec{r}, \vec{p}), \tag{26}$$

Thus, after some algebraic manipulation, we are able to express the total number of particles associated with our system as follows

$$N = N_0 + V\left[\Big(\frac{m\kappa T}{2\pi\hbar^2}\Big)^{3/2} g_{3/2}(z) - \alpha\frac{m^2\kappa T}{2\pi^2\hbar^3} g_1(z)\right], \tag{27}$$

where V is the volume of the container, N_0 is the number of particles in the ground state, and $z = e^{\beta\mu}$ is the fugacity [42]. The function $g_\nu(z)$ is the so–called Bose–Einstein function defined by [42]

$$g_\nu(z) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\nu)} \int_0^\infty \frac{x^{\nu-1}dx}{z^{-1}e^x - 1}. \tag{28}$$

Notice that the Bose–Einstein function diverges for $z = 1$ when $\nu \leq 1$ [42]. The behavior of the Bose–Einstein functions and its relation with the value of the chemical potential is usually used as a criterion of condensation [27, 42]. Apparently, Bose–Einstein condensation in the thermodynamic limit is not possible for this system, due to the divergent behavior of the Bose–Einstein function $g_1(z)$, when $\mu = 0$, as can be seen from expression (27). In the usual case, $\alpha = 0$, we have only the term proportional to $g_{3/2}(z)$ in expression (27), in this situation, the condensation is possible in three dimensions for a bosonic gas in a box, and if we assume that the ground state energy for this system is zero then, we are able to set the value of $\mu = 0$ safely without problems of divergence, and $g_{3/2}(1)$ is just $\zeta(3/2)$ at the condensation temperature. Nevertheless, the minimum value associated to the energy for a modified bosonic gas in a box is not zero, in fact this value is $m\alpha^2/2$. These assumptions allow us to express the number of particles at the condensation temperature as follows (assuming $N_0 \approx 0$ at the condensation temperature)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{N}{V} = {} & \Big(\frac{m\kappa T_c}{2\pi\hbar^2}\Big)^{3/2} g_{3/2}(e^{\beta_c m\alpha^2/2}) \\ & - \alpha\frac{m^2\kappa T_c}{2\pi^2\hbar^3} g_1(e^{\beta_c m\alpha^2/2}).\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

By using the properties of the Bose–Einstein functions when $\beta_c m\alpha^2/2 \to 0$ [42], we may now express equation (29) as follows

$$\frac{N}{V} \simeq \Big(\frac{m\kappa T_c}{2\pi\hbar^2}\Big)^{3/2}\zeta(3/2) - \alpha\frac{m^2\kappa T_c}{2\pi\hbar^3}\left[1 - \ln\Big(\frac{2\kappa T_c}{m\alpha^2}\Big)\right] \tag{30}$$

where T_c is the condensation temperature. If we set $\alpha = 0$, we recover the usual result for the condensation temperature associated to a bosonic gas trapped in a box in the thermodynamic limit [42, 44]

$$\kappa T_0 = \frac{2\pi\hbar^2}{m}\Big(\frac{N}{V\zeta(3/2)}\Big)^{2/3}. \tag{31}$$

At this point it is noteworthy to mention that the thermodynamic limit is defined as $N \to \infty$, $V \to \infty$, keeping N/V constant [10, 44]. With this definition, the condensation temperature is well defined. From expressions (30) and (31), we obtain the shift on the condensation temperature caused by the deformation parameter α in function of the number of particles

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{T_c - T_0}{T_0} \equiv \frac{\Delta T_c}{T_0} \simeq {} & \alpha\frac{2m}{3\hbar}\left(\frac{V\zeta(3)}{N}\right)^{-1/3} \\ & \times\left[1 - \ln\left(\frac{4\pi\hbar^2}{(m\alpha)^2}\Big(\frac{N}{V\zeta(3)}\Big)^{2/3}\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Clearly, in the limit $\alpha \to 0$; $\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_0} \to 0$. The current high precision experiments for ${}^{39}_{19}K$, show that the shift in the condensation temperature respect to the ideal result, caused by the interactions among the constituents of the gas is about 5×10^{-2} with a 1% of error [30]. These facts, allow to compare the results given here, in order to infer representative bounds for the deformation parameter ξ_1. Under typical conditions, the particle density $n = N/V$, varies from $10^{13} - 10^{15}$ atoms per cm^3 [10, 47]. Using these data, we are able to bound the deformation parameter up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 5.2$, for $n \approx 10^{13}$ atoms per cm^3, that is, two orders of magnitude less than in [37], and of the same order of magnitude that in [5], which is noticeable. In addition, the correction in the condensation temperature caused by α, which is proportional to $n^{-1/3}(1 - \ln n^{2/3})$, can be enlarged in systems with sufficiently small n, but where the thermodynamic limit is still valid. These facts suggest that more diluted systems could be used, in principle, to improve the bounds associated to ξ_1 or even to obtain a direct measure of such parameter.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have analyzed a modified bosonic gas in a box within the Bogolioubov formalism. We have calculated the corrections on the ground state energy of this system, and consequently the corrections in the pressure and the associated speed of sound. Additionally, we have analyzed the shift in the condensation temperature caused by a deformed dispersion relation. Concerning the analysis of the associated speed of sound, this allows us to bound the deformation parameter up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^3$ assuming a speed of sound of order $10^{-3}\mathrm{m}s^{-1}$. Nevertheless, expression (23) suggests that denser systems would allow to improve the bounds on ξ_1, but where the diluteness condition, $n|a|^3 << 1$, must be fulfilled. By using equation (23), we obtain for different values of the density, $n \sim 10^{15}$ atoms per m^3 a bound up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^2$, for $n \sim 10^{16}$ atoms per m^3; $|\xi_1| \lesssim 0.7$, and for $n \sim 10^{18}$ atoms per m^3 ; $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^{-3}$, assuming a typical speed of sound of order $10^{-3}\mathrm{m}s^{-1}$. Additionally, the corrections on the healing length lead to a bound up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^{-2}$ assuming a healing length of order $10^{-6}\mathrm{m}$.

On the other hand, the shift on the condensation temperature caused by the deformation parameter, leads to a bound up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 5.7$, under typical laboratory conditions. This bound could be improved, even more in diluted systems, that is, the opposite behavior, if one wants to infer a bound on ξ_1 by using the speed of sound or the healing length corrections.

Clearly, the results given in this work, must be extended to a more realistic situation. First, from the experimental point of view, there is no condensates in a box. Usually, the confinement of the condensate can be obtained by using harmonic traps, among others [10, 44] and the use of generic potentials, under certain conditions, could be used to constrain Planck scale physics in this context, by changing the shape of the trap [36, 37]. In other words, the analysis of a system trapped in generic potential within the Bogolioubov formalism deserves further investigation, and will be presented elsewhere [40]. Finally, we must add that the measure of the corrections caused by the deformation parameter ξ_1, could be out of the current technology. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that the many–body contributions in a Bose–Einstein condensate, open the possibility of planning specific scenarios that could be used, in principle, to obtain a possible measure of the effects caused by the quantum structure of space–time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by CONACyT México under grants CB-2009-01, no. 132400, CB-2011, no. 166212, and I0101/131/07 C-234/07 of the Instituto Avanzado de Cosmología (IAC) collaboration (http://www.iac.edu.mx/).

---

[1] G. Amelino-Camelia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D9, 1663 (2003).
[2] G. Amelino-Camelia, gr-qc/0806.0339v1, 2008.
[3] V. A. Kosteleckỳ, R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D 63, 065008, (2001).
[4] G. Amelino-Camelia, Lect. Notes Phys. 541, 1 (2000)
[5] G. Amelino-Camelia, C. Laemmerzahl, F. Mercati, and G. M. Tino, Phys. Rev. Lett, **103**, 171302 (2009)
[6] F. Mercati, D. Mazon, G. Amelino-Camelia, J.M. Carmona, J.L. Cortes, J. Indurain, C. Lammerzahl, and G.M. Tino, Class. Quant. Grav. 27, 215003 (2010).
[7] G. Amelino-Camelia, gr-qc/9808029, Nature 398, 216 (1999).
[8] L. Smolin, Three roads to quantum gravity (Basic Books, 2002).
[9] J. Alfaro, H.A. Morales-Tecotl, L.F. Urrutia, Phys. Rev. D66, 124006 (2002).
[10] F. Dalfovo, S. Giordini, L. Pitaevskii, S. Strangari, Reviews of Modern Physics, Vol. 71, No. 3, April (1999) pp. 463-512.
[11] V. Bagnato, D. E. Pritchard, D. Kleppner, Phys. Rev. **A 35** (1987).
[12] S. Grossmann and M. Holthaus, Phys. Lett. **A 208** (1995).
[13] S. Giorgini, L. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Phys. Rev. A **54** (1996)
[14] H. Haugerud, T. Haugset, F. Ravnal, Phys. Lett. **A 225** (1997).
[15] H. Shi and W. M. Zheng, Phys. Rev. A **A 56** 1046, (1996).
[16] Z. Yan, Phys. A **298**, 455 (2001).
[17] L. Salasnich, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **16**, 2185 (2002).
[18] O. Zobay, J. Phys. B 37, 2593 (2004).
[19] A. Jaouadi, M. Telmini, and E. Charron, arXiv:1011.6477v1 [cond-mat.quant-gas] (2010).
[20] W. Ketterle and N. J. van Druten, Phys. Rev. **A 54** (1996).
[21] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 5048 (1996).
[22] S. Grossmann and M. Holthaus, Phys. Rev. **E 54**, (1996).
[23] S. Grossmann and M. Holthaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. Vol 79 (1997).
[24] M. R. Andrews et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 553–556 (1997).
[25] M. R. Andrews et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2967–556 (1998).
[26] V. I. Yukalov, Laser Phys. Lett. **1**, 435-461 (2004).
[27] V. I. Yukalov, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 033608 (2005).
[28] V.I. Yukalov, arXiv:1105.4992v1, (2011).
[29] Vitaly. V. Kocharovsky, Vladimir. V. Kocharovsky, M. Holthaus, C. H. Raymond Ooi, A. Svidzinsky, W. Ketterle, and M. O. Scully, arXiv:cond-mat/0605507v [cond-mat.stat-mech] (2006).
[30] R.P. Smith, R.L.D. Campbell, N. Tammuz, and Z. Hadzibabic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 250403 (2011).
[31] D. Colladay and P. McDonald, Phys. Rev. **D70** (2004), 125007.
[32] D. Colladay and P. McDonald, Phys. Rev. **D73** (2006),

105006.
[33] A. Camacho, Class. Quantum Grav. 23 (2006), pp. 7355-7368.
[34] E. Castellanos, A. Camacho, Gen. Rel. Grav. **41**, 2677-2685, (2009).
[35] E. Castellanos, A. Camacho, Modern Physics Letters A, Vol. 25, No. 6, 459–469, (2010).
[36] E. Castellanos, C. Laemmerzah, arXiv:1202.3806, (2011).
[37] E. Castellanos, C. Laemmerzahl, Modern Physics Letters A Vol. 27, No. 31 (2012).
[38] F. Briscese, M. Grether, M. de Llano, arXiv:1204.4670v2, (2012).
[39] F. Briscese, arXiv:1206.1236, (2012).
[40] E. Castellanos, In progress.
[41] Kevrekidis, Dimitri J. Frantzeskakis, Ricardo Carretero-Gonzalez, *Emergent nonlinear phenomena in Bose-Einstein condensates: theory and experiment*, Springer, (2008).
[42] R. K. Pathria, *Statistical Mechanics* (Butterworth–Heinemann, Oxford, 1996).
[43] L. Pitaevski and S. Stringari, *Bose–Einstein Condensation* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2003).
[44] C. J. Pethick and H. Smith, *Bose–Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).
[45] G. F. Gribakin and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A 48, 546 (1993).
[46] M. Ueda, *Fundamentals and New Frontiers of Bose–Einstein Condensation* (World Scientic, Singapore, 2010).
[47] A. Griffin, T. Nikuni, and E. Zaremba, *Bose–Condensed Gases at Finite Temperatures* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009).